

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,247	07/09/2003	Philip S. Kim	DRPK-0003	9491
23377 7	590 03/23/2006		EXAM	INER
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP			STIGELL, THEODORE J	
	ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR 1650 MARKET STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		\mathcal{C}
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,247	KIM, PHILIP S.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Theodore J. Stigell	3763
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap		th the correspondence address
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (136(a): In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON te, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
_	Enhruany 2006	
 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 i</u> 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) Th 	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		ers prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under	•	-
·		,
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the applicatio		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	cepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)	nts have been received	
2. Certified copies of the priority documer		pplication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		
application from the International Burea	•	Toolivou III tillo Hallona, Olago
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis		received.
	•	
Attachmont(a)		
Attachment(s) 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Intonvious S	Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s	s)/Mail Date
3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/21/2003</u> .	6)	 '

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

In response to the Applicant's traversal filed on February 7, 2006, the Examiner agrees with the Applicant and has withdrawn the Restriction Requirement. Claims 1-31 were examined on the merits in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 22 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Xavier (5,458,631). Xavier discloses an implantable catheter and pump used for long term pain management comprising a surgically implanted catheter (12) having a discharge portion (30) that is capable of lying in a neural structure peripheral to a central nervous system and an implantable pump (32) and reservoir (38) located in a subcutaneous tissue, wherein a proximal end of the catheter, and the reservoir, are in fluid communication with the pump and the pump is operated to deliver a predetermined dosage of medication through the discharge portion into the peripheral neural structure, thereby alleviating pain and providing pain management and wherein the catheter has an embedded and electrically conductive material (14) throughout the catheter length sufficient to enable electrical conduction, the material facilitating stimulation to verify a catheter distal end location adjacent to the neural structure.

Art Unit: 3763

Claims 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Galindo (4,411,657). Galindo discloses a surgical needle for use in inserting a catheter comprising an electrically conductive shaft (14) having a first end (16) adapted to enter a facial sheath of a neural structure, a second end, wherein the shaft has an interior channel running longitudinally there through, and an electrically conductive protrusion (30) extending from the shaft to create a corner there between, the protrusion facilitating connection to a clip located at the distal end of a nerve stimulator.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Xavier (5,458,631). Xavier discloses the invention as substantially claimed. Xavier does not disclose the specific medication or the amount of medication to administer to the patient. However, these parameters are deemed matters of design choice, well

within the skill of the ordinary artisan, obtained through routine experimentation in determining the results.

Claims 1-21 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein et al. (Anesth Analg 2000; 91:1473-1478) in view of Xavier (5,458,631). Klein et al. disclose a method of providing long term pain management that includes most of the limitations as recited in claims 1-21 and 30-31, including surgically implanting a catheter to create an infusion site, wherein a discharge portion of the catheter lies in a peripheral neural structure, attaching a pump to the catheter and operating the pump to deliver a predetermined dosage of medication through the discharge portion of the catheter into the infusion site. However, Klein et al. teach to use a disposable infusion pump to deliver the drugs instead of an implantable infusion pump.

Xavier discloses an implantable catheter and pump that provides long term pain management by infusing drugs into the epidural space of the patient. Xavier teaches to use a permanently implantable pump to reduce damage to the patient's skin and to reduce the risk of infection.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Klein et al. with the implantable pump of Xavier to make a method that was less prone to cause damage or infection to the patient.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/616,247

Art Unit: 3763

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theodore J. Stigell whose telephone number is 571-272-8759. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Theodore J. Stigell

brown and a second